



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ERRATUM.

The last line of the first paragraph on page 199 should read: "as a mediæval Cæsar possessed of the opposite qualities," instead of "as the deadly foe which must be overthrown at all hazards."

THE ENCYCLICAL AGAINST MODERNISM.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.LTT.

POPE PIUS X is in the fifth year of his pontificate. He began as a liberal Pope, proposing to reform all things in Christ, and for about two years he seemed bent upon carrying out his ideal. But suddenly there came a change; the environment of the Roman Curia was too strong for him, and they persuaded him to follow in the footsteps of Pius IX, and oppose Reform as the most dangerous of heresies. He began as a broad-minded, warm-hearted, tolerant, conciliatory, lovable Pope, the humble servant of Christ, popular with all classes of people, who were ready to rally about him with enthusiasm for the work of reform. He now appears in his attitude towards the French Episcopate and the Italian Catholic Nationalists, in the decisions of the Biblical Commission, and especially in the new Syllabus and Encyclical, as the deadly foe which must be overthrown at all hazards.

How can such a transformation be explained? Some see in him a man to be pitied for his weakness in the hands of an ecclesiastical Camarilla, who make him a real prisoner of the Vatican, because they do not permit him to see the truth and reality of the outer world, but only matters and things as they represent them to him. But the mass of the voters of Italy and France cannot make this discrimination; they regard clericalism as the great enemy of the people and the Roman hierarchy as the deadly foe which must be overthrown at all hazards.

It is difficult for an American to appreciate the situation in the Latin countries, where the people are Catholic, but the masses of the men are anti-clerical. We are accustomed to free churches in a free state. We cannot appreciate this state of war, and the injustices and hardships that result from it. In Italy the people are so bitterly anti-clerical that the highest dignitaries

of the Papal court have been insulted in the streets of Rome, and it is unsafe for them to appear in public without the protection of that very Italian Government which they ordinarily ignore and despise. Under such circumstances, one would naturally suppose that the Curia would pursue a prudent policy. But they have chosen the reverse, and are doing all in their power to stir up strife all over the Christian world with a madness that is the sure precursor of ruin. They have issued a new Syllabus of errors and an Encyclical against Modernism; they propose a new Inquisition; they are hurrying on the canonization of Pius IX; they are even proposing another infallible dogma, the Assumption of the Virgin, and a recalling of the Vatican Council to enhance still further the authority of the Pope, and protect it from the supposed encroachments of modern States. Pius IX, by his arbitrary measures, brought on the destruction of the temporal power of the Papacy; Pius X is on the way to still more serious results.

The Syllabus is a collection of sixty-five statements which are condemned as errors. These statements are not, so far as I have been able to trace them, the verbal statements of any one, save the authors of the Syllabus; but they are based upon statements made by Loisy, Tyrrell and other Catholic scholars whose writings have been put on the Index. I have traced a considerable number of these in their writings; in no single instance are the exact words of these writings given; but their supposed ideas, with some of the principal words, are put into entirely new sentences composed by the authors of the Syllabus. It is easy to see what grave injustice is thereby done to these scholars. They are deprived of the right of stating and explaining their own opinions; but their ideas are first interpreted, or, rather, misinterpreted, by their enemies, then put into statements which mingle their words with the words of their enemies. Their ideas are wrested and distorted; and then they are held up before the world as guilty of serious errors for these very statements composed by their enemies; and, finally, they are charged with temerity and disrespect of authority, if they question the validity of these statements, or disclaim any responsibility for them. I shall give an example. The twenty-second error of the Syllabus reads as follows:

“The dogmas which the Church gives out as revealed are not truths

which have fallen down from heaven, but are an interpretation of religious facts, which the human mind has acquired by laborious effort."

Loisy says ("The Gospel and the Church," p. 210):

"The conceptions that the Church presents as revealed dogmas are not truths fallen from heaven, *and preserved by religious tradition in the precise form in which they first appeared*. *The historian sees in them the interpretation of religious facts, acquired by a laborious effort of theological thought. Though the dogmas may be Divine in origin and substance, they are human in structure and composition.*"

This statement of Loisy is careful, accurate and well guarded. It is difficult to see how any one who knows anything of Biblical Theology and the history of dogma can doubt it. These Roman scholastics who know neither Bible nor history, and make the scholastic theology the universal norm, may deny it; but they had no right to misrepresent Loisy by leaving out the qualifying clauses which were essential to express his meaning. I have italicized the most important of these.

We cannot dwell upon the Syllabus, for we must give our space to a study of the Encyclical. This Encyclical is addressed, like all other documents of the same kind, to the Episcopate throughout the world. It is thus in a sense oecumenical; but it does not on that account belong to the category of infallible documents: for the Pope does not therein "define a doctrine regarding faith and morals to be held by the universal Church." He describes Modernism, defines certain errors and prescribes disciplinary procedure against them. There is no definition of doctrine, except so far as the condemnation of errors may be regarded as an implication of different opinions, which in many cases, at least, may be several and not single, and in no case a precise definition of a doctrine. The Encyclical, therefore, belongs to a class of documents, issued by the Pope, which may contain mistaken judgments liable to correction and change. The Canon Law requires that they should be recognized as authoritative, as regulating external obedience and submission in conduct; but they do not bind the conscience nor require internal consent involving submission of the judgment and change of opinion or conscientious convictions. A Catholic scholar has the right, and in some cases the duty, of questioning their validity, especially when, as is the case with this Encyclical, his opinions are misrepresented, his motives and character blackened,

and he is threatened with ecclesiastical discipline on false or mistaken charges. He may do what has often been done in similar circumstances—appeal from a Pope ill informed to a Pope well informed. It would be difficult to find an instance in modern history in which the elementary principles of justice have been so thoroughly disregarded as in the recent Papal decree of excommunication against the unknown authors, and all who assisted them in the composition of the "*Il Programma dei Modernisti, Risposta All' Enciclica di Pio X: 'Pascendi Dominici Gregis'*"; in which several representative Italian priests show very clearly that their views are misrepresented in the Encyclical. The Encyclical describes the opinions of the Modernists, and then excommunicates those who complain that the description is incorrect, and that without knowing their names, or permitting them to be heard in self-defence. The Encyclical is directed against the doctrines of the Modernists. Who are the Modernists? The name is given by the Encyclical to those known throughout the world as liberal Catholics. I know of no previous use of the term as a party designation, except in the religious struggles in Holland between liberal and conservative Protestants. The terms "modern views," "modern men" and similar expressions are not uncommon; but "Modernist" as applied to a religious party in the Catholic Church is unknown to our dictionaries. Liberal Catholics do not, so far as I know, object to the designation, if it carries with it the natural meaning that they are Modernists in their attitude towards Theology, as distinguishing them from Mediævalists; but they do object to the term if it implies the description given of them in the Encyclical, which they regard as a caricature and utter misrepresentation.

The Encyclical begins with an analysis of Modernist teaching. This analysis cannot be found in the writings of the Modernists; for, according to the Encyclical: "Since the Modernists employ a very clever artifice, namely, to present their doctrines without order or systematic arrangement into one whole, scattered and disjointed, one from another—it will be of advantage to bring their teachings together here into one group, and to point out the connection between them, and thus to pass to an examination of the sources of the errors." The analysis that follows is, therefore, avowedly not an analysis for which any Modernist is responsible, but one for which the Encyclical

alone is responsible. The analysis of Modernism is this: "Agnosticism is its philosophical foundation," "the negative part of the system"; "Vital Immanence is its positive part." This is the illustration:

"In the person of Christ, they say, Science and History encounter nothing that is not human. Therefore, in virtue of the first canon deduced from Agnosticism, whatever there is in His history suggestive of the divine must be rejected. Then, according to the second canon, the historical person of Christ was transfigured by faith; therefore, everything that raises it above historical conditions must be removed. Lastly, the third canon, which lays down that the person of Christ has been disfigured by faith, requires that everything should be excluded: deeds and words and all else that is not in keeping with His character, circumstances and education, and with the place and time in which He lived."

The Encyclical goes on to say: "There are many Catholics, yea, and priests, too, who say these things openly, and they boast that they are going to reform the Church by these ravings."

Now, if this were a fair description of the Modernists, and it were true that there were many such Catholic priests, no one could rightly blame the Pope for issuing the Encyclical against them, for such opinions are certainly destructive of the Catholic Faith. But who are these Catholic agnostics? Loisy and Tyrrell, the chief Roman Catholic liberals of our day, who are under severe discipline of the Roman Curia, are not such agnostics. Their views are clearly stated in numerous published writings. Fogazzaro and the writers of the "*Rinnovamento*" are not agnostics. The authors of the "*Risposta*" say distinctly that this charge is false. If there are such agnostic Catholics, let the Curia proceed against them and no one can justly complain. But, in fact, they are giving a philosophical basis to the opinions of the liberal Catholics which, so far as it appears, is entirely hypothetical, devised in scholastic brains, which have formulated a category for these liberals which they refuse and disclaim; and they have proceeded against the above-mentioned liberal Catholics to the extent of excommunication, as if they were what they really are not. The Curia blacken their doctrines and characters, and then excommunicate them for being blackened. As Tyrrell says (London "*Times*," September 30th, 1907):

"It is plain that Modernists are, because logically they ought to be,

agnostics and atheists. . . The whole of this vast controversial structure is poised by a most ingenious, logical *tour de force* on the apex of a science-theory and psychology that are as strange as astrology to the modern mind, and are practically unknown outside Seminary walls, save to the historian of philosophy. Touch this science-theory, and the whole argument is in ruins."

Such a procedure against these Modernists has been recently justified by a member of the Curia, who said: "Well, if they are not such agnostics they still are guilty of heresy in other respects, and therefore have no reason to complain of injustice." And this leads us to the consideration of some other descriptions of the Modernists. Modernism is represented as "the Synthesis of all Heresies." It is quite convenient, therefore, for any one so disposed, to charge a Catholic scholar with being a Modernist, if he has written, or spoken, anything that might be regarded as heretical.

The next most serious charge against the Modernists is that they hold to the "intrinsic evolution of dogma." It is quite true that some liberal Catholics, like Loisy, make great use of the principle of evolution in their study of dogma; but many of them do not. As Tyrrell says ("Scylla and Charybdis," p. 335): "Liberal Catholics are not cast in one mould like Seminary students; nor are all admirers of Newman, or Loisy, sworn to a servile imitation of their views. I am in some respects much more old-fashioned than either, in other respects much more new-fashioned." Tyrrell himself questions Newman's theory of development, and takes a much more conservative position. Furthermore, it is certain that the implication of the Encyclical, that modern Criticism, Biblical and Historical, is based on the doctrine of development, is altogether false. It is based upon an induction of truths and facts as strictly as in the case of any other Science. If critics have adopted the principle of development, it is simply because it seems best to explain all the facts as determined by induction. They are just as ready as are the students of Natural Science to accept any theory, provisionally, that seems best to account for the facts.

It seems quite evident that the Encyclical intends to classify all the disciples of Newman among the Modernists. I feel assured that that is not the intention of the Pope, but it is the intention of the scholastic authors of the Encyclical. The way

in which they oppose evolution and development of dogma, and the value of probable evidence and religious certitude, strikes against the most characteristic principles of Newman, which made it possible for him and his followers to be and remain Catholics. One of these scholastics who is credited by rumor, sustained by internal evidence, as one of the chief authors of the Encyclical, is known as a lifelong opponent of Newman. I have it on excellent authority that a Roman Cardinal said that "if Newman were now living he would be classed as a heretic." This is not at all surprising. It is a thankless task in the Roman Church to be defenders of the Faith. The greatest apologists have been discredited in Rome: Bellarmine, Bossuet, Möhler, Schell and now Newman. It is a common opinion among writers on Symbolics that it is impossible for the scholar to know what Rome really teaches. The greatest scholars who build on the ecumenical documents and all official decisions of the Church, and think that they are defenders of Roman orthodoxy, are almost certain to be condemned by the ecclesiastics of Rome, who are determined to keep in their own hands the exclusive interpretation of the Faith.

It is impracticable to go through the document and discuss its details, which would show that the Encyclical is really a trap to catch the unwary—indeed, any person who, in any respect, differs in opinion with the Roman scholastics. It will be sufficient to cite their own summary statement of the errors of the Modernist Reformers:

"From all that has preceded, some idea may be gained of the reforming mania which possesses them: in all Catholicism there is absolutely nothing on which it does not fasten. Reform of philosophy, especially in the seminaries: the scholastic philosophy is to be relegated to the history of philosophy among obsolete systems, and the young men are to be taught modern philosophy, which alone is true and suited to the times in which we live. Reform of theology: rational theology is to have modern philosophy for its foundation, and positive theology is to be founded on the history of dogma. As for history, it must be for the future written and taught only according to their modern methods and principles. Dogmas and their evolution are to be harmonized with science and history. In the catechism no dogmas are to be inserted except those that have been duly reformed and are within the capacity of the people. Regarding worship, the number of external devotions is to be reduced, or at least steps must be taken to prevent their further increase, though, indeed, some of the admirers of symbol-

ism are disposed to be more indulgent on this head. Ecclesiastical government requires to be reformed in all its branches, but especially in its disciplinary and dogmatic parts. Its spirit and its external manifestations must be put in harmony with the public conscience, which is now wholly for democracy; a share in ecclesiastical government should therefore be given to the lower ranks of the clergy, and even to the laity, and authority should be decentralized. The Roman Congregations, and especially the Index and the Holy Office, are to be reformed. The ecclesiastic authority must change its line of conduct in the social and political world; while keeping outside political and social organization, it must adapt itself to those which exist in order to penetrate them with its spirit. With regard to morals, they adopt the principle of the Americanists, that the active virtues are more important than the passive, both in the estimation in which they must be held and in the exercise of them. The clergy are asked to return to their ancient lowliness and poverty, and in their ideas and action to be guided by the principles of Modernism; and there are some who, echoing the teaching of their Protestant masters, would like the suppression of ecclesiastical celibacy. What is there left in the Church which is not to be reformed according to their principles?"

To this we might add the query, What Catholic outside the Roman Curia does not desire one or more of these reforms? Unless I am greatly mistaken, a very large portion of educated Catholic bishops, priests and laymen in France, Switzerland, Germany, Great Britain and America are smitten by one or more of these condemnations. When now to this is added the condemnation of the separation of Church and State and the denial of the right of the Catholic citizen "to work for the common good, in the way he thinks best, without troubling himself about the authority of the Church," and the rejection of the principle that "to trace out and prescribe for the citizen any line of conduct, on any pretext whatsoever, is to be guilty of an abuse of ecclesiastical authority"; it is difficult to see how a Catholic can be obedient to the Encyclical and be a good citizen of any modern State. If an attempt were to be made in Great Britain, Germany or America to carry out these principles, it is certain that clericalism would be regarded as the great enemy there, as it is now in most Catholic countries.

The Encyclical, therefore, is a thoroughgoing attack on Modernism, not simply upon liberal Catholics, but upon all that is characteristic of the modern age of the world, in Philosophy, Science, Biblical Criticism, History, Education, and Political and Social Life. It is an effort to overcome Modernism by Mediæval-

ism, by making the scholastic Philosophy and Theology of the Middle Ages the norm for all things in all time. The Encyclical is *thorough*; but, like many other historic examples of such thoroughness, it is blind to the consequences of such a policy. It brought Charles II and his ministers to the scaffold, and has destroyed many another brilliant career. If the scholastic philosophy and theology of Thomas Aquinas is to be the universal norm for the Roman Catholic Church, the Roman Church thereby divests itself of Catholicity, for it sins against the established principles of Catholicity, "*Semper, ubique et ab omnibus.*" It antagonizes not only the modern world, but no less truly the ancient Church, which knew nothing of scholasticism, and still more Jesus Christ and His Apostles, who knew nothing of the principles and methods of the Greek philosophers. Apostolicity is the historic test of a genuine Christianity—not Scholasticism. The Roman scholars are fond of giving the logical consequences of Modernist theories; let them consider the logical consequences of their own position, which would change the creed from "One holy, catholic and apostolic Church" to "one Roman and scholastic Church."

It is well known that Thomas Aquinas was regarded in his day as a heretic and a reformer. The Aristotelian philosophy was condemned at first as sharply as Modern philosophy is in this Encyclical. The authors of the "*Risposta*" claim that they are the true successors of the scholastic theologians, in that they adhere to their spirit of investigation rather than to their stereotyped modes of thought and statement. So Tyrrell says ("Scylla and Charybdis," p. 350):

"I have the sincerest veneration for the truly theological spirit of my earliest guide, St. Thomas Aquinas; but I have very little for the drilled school of theologists who invoke his name, and swear by the letter of his work to the destruction of its spirit."

The scholastic theology is built upon the Aristotelian philosophy as expounded especially by the mediæval scholastics, of whom Thomas Aquinas was the greatest. All Roman Catholic doctrines since have been stated on the basis of that philosophy and the scholastic methods of Aquinas. But the ancient Creeds were constructed with reference to the principles of the Platonic philosophy. There is a basis of union between the two, but there

are also irreconcilable differences. The teachings of Jesus and His Apostles were on the basis of the Old Testament, and had no manner of relation to either Plato or Aristotle. Which is to be the master of theology, Aristotle or Plato or Christ? The Encyclical virtually dethrones Christ and enthrones St. Thomas as the vicar of Aristotle.

I said in this REVIEW, in my article on "Reform in the Catholic Church," that Leo XIII had taken an important step in reform when he called Catholic theologians away from the newer scholasticism to the study of the greatest of the scholastics, Thomas Aquinas. I have not changed my opinion. But in fact this reform has been more nominal than real, for the reason that it has been obeyed only in form and not in spirit. Any one can see, who will study the system of the chief Roman scholastics at the present time, such as Billot and Janssen, that, while they use the forms of St. Thomas and base themselves on his system, they really introduce into the system scholastic materials, new and old, which are not homogeneous with St. Thomas, but which make a heterogeneous system that St. Thomas himself would be the first to repudiate. How, for instance, can they adapt the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin to the system of St. Thomas when he expressly denies it. The movement in their hands is a sham and a fraud.

The Faith of the Church, according to Catholic doctrine, is a sacred deposit derived from Jesus Christ and His Apostles, whose substance remains unchangeably the same. The Church can only interpret it, and apply it to new circumstances and conditions. As I understand them, the so-called Modernists agree to that. Loisy distinctly says in the extract given above (which is carefully omitted in the statement of error), that "though dogmas may be divine in origin and substance they are human in structure and composition." Tyrrell has returned to what he regards as the "earlier and stricter view." "Understanding by 'dogma' a religious truth imposed authoritatively as the Word of God, not as a conclusion of theological reflection, it rejects the very notion of the development, and still more of the multiplication, of dogmas, and acquiesces cordially in the patristic identification of novelty and heresy ("Scylla and Charybdis," pp. 4-5). According to Loisy, the substance of dogma is divine and unchangeable, the structure and composition are human and

changeable. According to Tyrrell, the dogmas are unchangeable because they are imposed authoritatively as the Word of God, not as a conclusion of theological reflection; in other words, he does not recognize the theological form as dogma. It is just this distinction that the scholastic authors of the Encyclical refuse to make. They dare not say that the scholastic form of the dogmas and the Aristotelian philosophy that shapes their statements were original, apostolic and divine; but, by failing to discriminate between the form and the substance of doctrine, and by maintaining that the dogmas in their scholastic form are normative, and that the scholastic dogma is unchangeable and irreformable, they really imply the divine origin of the scholastic form as well as the apostolic substance; and this, at bottom, is the whole quarrel between the Curia and the Modernists. As Tyrrell says (London "Times," October 1st):

"For the Middle Ages with their statical modes of thought, their crude conceptions of government and authority, derived from Pagan Imperialism, their view of physical law as analogous to civil law, imposed or abrogated at the will of the lawgivers, there was perhaps no other way of apprehending Christianity, which, however, is older than, and therefore separable from, these categories. The Encyclical holds to such categories still, but, rightly or wrongly, the world has swept them aside; nor will any argument, however ingenious, which assumes their validity, receive the slightest attention. No such *instauratio omnium* need be hoped or feared."

The general description of the Modernists given by the Encyclical is so apart from reality that the first impression naturally is that the best way to deal with it is to ignore it, or to recognize it by agreeing in the reprobation of such Modernists, and affirming that they do not exist in "our diocese." This seems to be the present attitude of the American Episcopate. But the second part of the document prescribes a new Inquisition and the organization of a vigilance committee in every diocese, with the purpose of banishing from theological seminaries and the Catholic press and every position of influence, every one who has the least trace, or suspicion, of Modernism, or favors it or condones it in any measure. If the plan of the new Inquisition can be carried out, it is difficult to see how any but a genuine Mediævalist can escape. But it is evident that the plan is too detailed and too drastic, and not sufficiently flexible to make it practicable in many parts of the world, and it is

certain that there will be an immense reluctance and every kind of passive resistance to the enforcement of these rules. It is true that it is ordained:

"That the Bishops of all dioceses, a year after the publication of these letters, and every three years thenceforward, furnish the Holy See with a diligent and sworn report on all the prescriptions contained in them, and on the doctrines that find currency among the clergy, and especially in the seminaries and other Catholic institutions, and we impose the like obligation on the Generals of religious orders with regard to those under them."

We shall wait to see whether the Bishops and Generals of orders will altogether comply with these commands. This great responsibility is thrown upon them without their advice, knowledge or consent. The Bishops have their rights in the divine constitution of the Church as well as the Pope, and these rights are protected by the same Canon Law that protects the Pope's; and, unless I am greatly mistaken, these rights are infringed upon in an unprecedented manner by this arbitrary ordinance of the present Pope. All the Bishops are successors of the Apostles; the Pope is the primate of the Bishops as St. Peter was of the Apostles. The Pope no more absorbs unto himself the whole authority in the government of the Church than did St. Peter.

The Vatican Council, when it defined the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, at the same time asserted, as it could not fail to do without heresy, that this was "without prejudice to the ordinary and immediate power of episcopal jurisdiction, by which Bishops, who have been set of the Holy Ghost to succeed and hold the place of the Apostles, feed and govern each his own flock as true pastors." And yet in this Encyclical, the Pope, without consultation with the episcopate, but solely under the advice of certain unnamed cardinals and other members of the Roman Curia, issues an ordinance requiring a "sworn report" from the Bishops as to their fidelity in enforcing his new Inquisition. If that is not an usurpation of authority and an enslavement of the episcopate, it is difficult to imagine what could be regarded as such. If Jesus Christ and His Apostles committed all ecclesiastical authority to the episcopate as the successors of the Apostles, it is no longer exercised by them in the Roman Church; but their place has been taken by a Curial body in Rome appointed by the Popes and responsible only to the Popes, but without any divine rights whatsoever. There

are the Cardinals, who are really bishops, priests and deacons of the province of Rome, exalted to be princes of the Church, even the deacons being high above Metropolitans and Patriarchs. They may have the divine right to govern the Roman province, but they have no divine right to govern the universal Church. There are also the Generals of the religious orders of every name, monks, mendicants and brethren, massing all the influence of these Associations in Rome with a local influence and practical authority transcending, and sometimes overreaching and overcoming, the influence of the episcopate scattered and divided throughout the world. The General of the Jesuits is called the Black Pope; more powerful than any one in Rome but the real Pope. None of these orders, none of these Generals of orders, has any part in the divine constitution of the Church, and any part they take in it is in defiance of the divine rights of the episcopate. There are the hosts of *monsignori*, appointed by the Popes as their court officials, who have as their chief functions to transact as officials the business of the Church. These have no part in the divine constitution of the Church, and yet they take a very important part in its government. These three groups of officials are really the governing body of the Roman Church, not only the power behind the throne, but the power that so surrounds the throne that nothing can be done except by them and through them. Even the Bishops only secure a hearing through them. Time and again an agreement between the Pope and a visiting Bishop has been overruled, and even denied after the departure of the Bishop from Rome. The treatment of the French episcopate, during the recent troubles, has been most shameful. Again and again have their decisions been overruled by the Curia; and, finally, as I have it on excellent authority, their very names were signed to an official document without their knowledge or consent. Truly, there is no hope for the Catholic Church until this Camarilla can be overthrown.

The "Saint" of Fogazzaro tells the Pope of this essential fault in the government of the Church when he says:

"Perhaps your Holiness has not yet made proof of it; but the spirit of domination would exercise itself also upon you. Yield not to it, Holy Father! To you belongs the government of the Church; permit not that others govern you, suffer not that your power be as a glove for the invisible hands of others. Have public counsellors, and let these be the Bishops, united often in national councils."

Alas! Pope Pius X has yielded, as so many others before him, to this irresponsible, invisible and secret domination, and the Bishops throughout the world are summoned to obey as slaves of their master. The "Saint" of Fogazzaro indicates clearly to the Pope the four evil spirits which threaten the ruin of the Catholic Church: The Spirit of Falsehood, The Spirit of Domination, The Spirit of Avarice, The Spirit of Immobility.

The Encyclical is evidently pervaded by these spirits, and shows clearly and unmistakably that the Roman Curia is determined, in the temper of these evil spirits, to resist and overcome any and every effort for reform. It would banish from the Church all the reformers that are named Modernists; it would give them over to Satan, or to Protestants, or to another Old Catholic sect. It does not wish the Reunion of Christendom, the peace and unity of the Christian Church; but simply and alone a body that will be submissive without question to its domination in doctrine and life, not only by external obedience of conformity, but by the internal obedience of a submissive conscience and an enslaved intellect.

I have a great respect for the person of the present Pope and reverence for his high office; and I regard the Catholic episcopate and priesthood as a devout and noble body of Christian men, and the Catholic Church on the whole as in a sound and healthful condition, ripe for reform and ready to reach forth for the highest ideals of Christianity. The Roman Curia is the canker, the running-sore, of the Papacy which is responsible for all the mischief. The worse it is the better, for that makes all the more evident the necessity of removing it at all hazards. I have said nothing but what hosts of Catholics of all ranks are saying at the present time, who are deeply grieved over the present situation. Once more the gates of hell are open in Rome, and evil spirits of all kinds are broken loose to corrupt and destroy the Church of God. They will do incalculable injury to-day as they have in the past, but our Lord Himself gave the reassuring word: "The gates of Hell shall not prevail against it."

CHARLES A. BRIGGS.